Meeting: Joint Site Reservoir Committee &

Authority Board

March 18, 2022 9:00 AM - 12:00 PM

Authority Board Chair: Fritz Durst (Reclamation District 108)

Authority Board Vice Chair: Jeff Sutton (Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority)

Reservoir Committee Chair: Thad Bettner (Glenn Colusa Irrigation District)

Reservoir Committee Vice-Chair: Valerie Pryor (Zone 7 Water Agency)

Treasurer: Jamie Traynham (Davis Water District)

Minutes

<u>CALL TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE</u>:

Authority Board Chair Durst called the Joint Authority Board (AB) and Reservoir Committee (RC) Meeting to order at the hour of 9:00 a.m., followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL/ATTENDANCE:

Roll of the Authority Board members was called (Attachment B) and there was a quorum present.

Roll of the Reservoir Committee was called (Attachment A), which resulted in 20 eligible representatives. This equated to 92% of the current participation percentage being in attendance, which is greater than the 50% needed to have a quorum of the Reservoir Committee.

INTRODUCTIONS:

The Sites Staff, Consultants, and members of the public introduced themselves.

AGENDA APPROVAL/RESERVOIR COMMITTEE/AUTHORITY BOARD:

It was moved by Director Evans, seconded by Azevedo to approve the March 18, 2022 Joint Reservoir Committee and Authority Board Meeting Agenda. Motion carried unanimously.

PERIOD FOR PUBLIC COMMENT:

Authority Board Chair Durst called for a period of public comment. Hearing none, he closed the period for public comment.

1. CONSENT AGENDA/RESERVOIR COMMITTEE:

It was moved by Tincher, seconded by Pryor to approve Consent Agenda Item Numbers 1.1 and 1.3 through 1.10, except for Item 1.2, the February 23, 2022 Authority Board Minutes, as follows:

- 1.1 Approve February 18, 2022, Reservoir Committee Meeting Minutes.
- 1.2 Approve the February February 23, 2022, Authority Board Meeting Minutes.

- 1.3 Accept the Sites Project Authority Treasurer's Report.
- 1.4 Approve the Payment of Claims.
- 1.5 Authorize teleconference meetings, pursuant to Brown Act Provision provided under Assembly Bill 361, effective through April 21, 2022.
- 1.6 Approve the Authority's Fiscal Year 2021 Annual Summary Financial Report.
- 1.7 Approve the financial quarterly report template.
- 1.8 Approve continuing the existing seven workgroups and committees through the Amendment 3 work period in conformance with the updated charters and general requirements for the Reservoir Committee Coordination Workgroup, Engineering & Operations Workgroup, Environmental Planning & Permitting Workgroup, Authority Board Coordination Committee, Legislative & Outreach Committee, Land Management Committee, Budget & Finance Committee.
- 1.9 Approve the new Records Management Policy, including the records retention schedule, to guide oversight and retention of the Authority's records and responding to public records requests with an effective date of July 1, 2022.
- 1.10 Accept the State and Federal Legislative 2022 priorities.

Motion carried unanimously.

CONSENT AGENDA/AUTHORITY BOARD:

It was moved by Director Murphy, seconded by Director Dennis to approve Consent Agenda Item Numbers 1.2 through 1.10 as follows:

- 1.2 Approve the February 23, 2022, Authority Board Meeting Minutes.
- 1.3 Accept the Sites Project Authority Treasurer's Report.
- 1.4 Approve the Payment of Claims.
- 1.5 Authorize teleconference meetings, pursuant to Brown Act Provision provided under Assembly Bill 361, effective through April 21, 2022.
- 1.6 Approve the Authority's Fiscal Year 2021 Annual Summary Financial Report.
- 1.7 Approve the financial quarterly report template.
- 1.8 Approve continuing the existing seven workgroups and committees through the Amendment 3 work period in conformance with the updated charters and general requirements for the Reservoir Committee Coordination Workgroup, Engineering & Operations Workgroup, Environmental Planning & Permitting

Workgroup, Authority Board Coordination Committee, Legislative & Outreach Committee, Land Management Committee, Budget & Finance Committee.

- 1.9 Approve the new Records Management Policy, including the records retention schedule, to guide oversight and retention of the Authority's records and responding to public records requests with an effective date of July 1, 2022.
- 1.10 Accept the State and Federal Legislative 2022 priorities.

Motion carried: All Directors present voted yes.

2. Action Items:

2.1 Consider directing staff to proceed with using the following approach as the basis of environmental review, permitting and water right application: (1) Alternative 3 as the Preferred Project Alternative instead of Alternative 1; and (2) adjusting to more restrictive diversion criteria to a level expected to achieve a higher degree of permitting certainty while maintaining project affordability. (Attachment A)

Ms. Forsythe provided an overview of changing to Alternative 3 and Adjustments to the Project's Diversion Criteria and spoke to the following:

Why are We Doing These Things and Why Now?

- If we want to consider these items, we should consider them now to reduce rework, schedule delays and costs of changing in the future
- Biological Assessment, Operations ITP, Water Right Application:
 - o All targeted for April/May submittal (depending on modeling).
 - Important to include our Preferred Project and "final" diversion criteria to reduce rework and renegotiation later.

Alternatives Considered in the Revised Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS

Facilities/ Operations	Alternative 1- Authority's Preferred Project	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
Rservoir Size	1.5 MAF	1.3 MAF	1.5MAF
Hydropower	Incidental upon release	Same as Alt 1	Same as Alt 1
Diversion locations	Red Bluff Pumping Plant and Hamilton City	Same as Alt 1	Same as Alt 1
Conveyance Release/Dunnigan Release	1,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) into new Dunnigan Pipeline To Colusa Basom Drain	1,000 cfs into new Dunnigan to Sacramento River. Partial release Into Colusa Basin Dr	
Reclamation Involvement	 Funding partner, up to 7% Operational Exchanges 	Operation Exchanges a. Within Year Exchanges	S Same as Alt 1, but up to 25% investment

Joint Authority Board & Reservoir Committee Meeting

March 18, 2022

a. Within Year Exchanges b. Real-time Exchanges

b. Real-time Exchanges

DWR Involvement Operation Exchanges with Same as Alt 1 Same as Alt 1

Oroville and storage in SWP facilities South-of- Delta

Route to West side Bridge across reservoir Paved road around Same as Alt 1

Of Reservoir southern end of

Reservoir

Consideration of Changes to the Federal Investment:

Reclamation sees benefits and has an interest in greater than 7% investment.

- Federal government in different financial situation today than in 2019.
- Reclamation's demand characteristics require more frequents fill/release improve project performance.
- Reclamation investment likely to be combination of storage allocation and compensation for anadromous fish benefits of exchanges.
- Adjusting Deadpool possible, would free up some capacity to allocate to Reclamation or other new participants.
- May need voluntary reduction by other members in the future if can't accommodate otherwise.

Determining Federal Investment:

- Determiningng exact Reclamation investment is subject to negotiations.
 - Further evaluation and negotiations, goal of completing main deal points within next 6 months.
 - o Goal would be to receive final commitment of federal funds on similar schedule as received from Participants.
- April 2022- Revised Modeling for Biological Assessment.
- May 2022-Reclamation completes revised economics analysis.
- Summer 2022-Reclamation submits OMB Addendum & Authority submits Letter Request for Investment to Reclamation.
- Fall/Winter 2022-Negotitations.
- Final commitment of federal funds on similar schedule as received from Participants.

Proposed Revisions to Diversion Criteria

Fremont Weir Yes

Parameter	Revised Draft EIR/ Supplemental Draft EIS with Mitigation	Proposed Revised Criteria
Wilkins Slough	10,700 cfs Mar-May; 5,000 Cfs Sept to Feb and June	10,700 cfs Oct-June; 5,000 cfs Sept
Pulse Flow Protection	Yes	Yes

None. Higher bypass flows

Protections

and pulse protection provide For the Notch

All other conditions of diversion criteria would remain the same.

Why Make These Revisions?

- Responsive to fisher agency and NGO comments on the Revised EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS.
- Higher degree of permitting certainty.
- Modeling sensitivity analysis indicate that with these changes, Project continues to generate sufficient benefits to meet affordability criteria.

Director Evans stated they should not be acquiescing to a more restrictive diversion criteria.

Discussion followed regarding clarification of federal funding investment, modeling sensitivity analysis, pulse flow and change in deadpool.

ACTION/RESERVOIR COMMITTEE:

It was moved by Cheng, seconded by Pryor to direct staff to proceed with using the following approach as the basis of environmental review, permitting and water right application: (1) Alternative 3 as the Preferred Project Alternative instead of Alternative 1; and (2) adjusting to more restrictive diversion criteria to a level expected to achieve a higher degree of permitting certainty while maintaining project affordability.

Motion carried unanimously.

ACTION/AUTHORITY BOARD:

It was moved by Director Dennis, seconded by Director Allen to direct staff to proceed with using the following approach as the basis of environmental review, permitting and water right application: (1) Alternative 3 as the Preferred Project Alternative instead of Alternative 1; and (2) adjusting to more restrictive diversion criteria to a level expected to achieve a higher degree of permitting certainty while maintaining project affordability.

Motion carried: All Directors present vote yes, with the exception of Director Evans (County of Colusa) who voted in opposition.

2.2 Consider authorizing the Executive Director to submit the Project's water right application for a Sites water right to the State Water Resources Control Board including associated application fee.

Ms. Forsythe provided an overview of the Project's water right application for a Sites water right to the State Water Resources Control Board and spoke to the following:

- Five key components of the application.
 - Project-specific Terms and Conditions Today.

- Water Availability Analysis Today.
- o POU and PORDs Completed.
- Diversion Criteria Completed.
- Basic Project Information Completed.
- Petition to amend and assign State Filing A025517 (Colusa Reservoir)
 - o Priority date of 9/30/1977.
- Request release from priority.
 - o A025514 (Glenn Reservoir).
 - A022513 (Glenn Reservoir -power).
- Sites water right application is for diversion of Sites water only no diversion of CVP or SWP water is included in water right.
 - o Some Sites water is provided to Reclamation as an investor.
 - Sites is not applying for a water right to divert or redivert Trinity River water.
- Proactively Addressing Concerns -Project-specific Terms and Conditions.
 - Winter Water Rights.
 - Subordinates diversions to the specific water rights dated post 9/30/1977.
- Funks and Stone Corral Creek Flows.
 - o Provides a process for address CA Fish and Game Code 5937
- Diversion Criteria.
 - Requires diversions be made in compliance with Project's Incidental Take Permit.
- Will be included in our application to proactively address issues and avoid protests.
- Proactively Addressing Concerns-Standard Terms will include:
 - o Term 90, Reduction of Diversion Season.
 - Subject to prior rights; during some years, water will not be available for diversion during portions or all of the season authorized.
 - o Term 91, Inbasin Entitlements.
 - No diversion authorized when satisfaction of inbasin entitlements requires supplemental release by CVP and SWP.
 - Term 96, Reserved Jurisdiction for Bay-Delta Plan Amendments.
 - SWRCB reserves jurisdiction to amend water right to establish new and modified Bay-Delta Plan.
 - Term 70, Compliance Plan (mandatory).
 - Compliance Plan required identifying how water right holder will comply with the terms and conditions of water right.
- List is not exhaustive of what we expect in the permit. More will come in during the protest resolution process and at final permit issuance.

Water Availability Analysis - Requirements and Approach Overview

- Projects seeking to appropriate water must demonstrate a "Reasonable likelihood of water available for appropriation".
- Three approaches (Historical, CalSim II, Face Value)

Reasonable Likelihood of Water Available for Appropriation

Approach	Result Take-away	Annual Average Available (acre-feet per water year)
Historial Analysis	Water available in all Year types* and 20 out 22 years in analysis	860,800 AF
CalSim II Model	Water available in all year Types and all but three out Of 82 years in analysis	1,500,000 AF
Face Value Analysis	Water available mainly in wet and above normal years, and about half of years in analysis	1,279,000 AF

^{*}Based on Sacramento Valley Water Year Index (40-30-30 Index)

Water Availability Analysis – Overall Conclusions:

- Robust and thorough analysis used three separate approaches with varying degree of conservatism.
- All analyses indicate:
 - o Reasonable likelihood of water available for Sites Project diversions.
 - Additional water available beyond the Sites Project diversions.
 - Sites is not taking ALL of the available water in the system.

Balanced Approach - Water available while:

- Avoiding injury to other water right holders.
- Avoiding unreasonable harm to the environment.
- Establishing that the Project protects public trust resources and otherwise is in the public interest.

Next Steps:

- Finalize the application and submit with application fee.
- Continue to meet with water district, NOGOs and others to discuss the application and address concerns.

Requested Action:

• Consider authorizing the Executive Director to submit the Project's water right application for a Sites water right to the State Water Resources Control Board including associated application fee.

Mr. Hitchings also provided a brief update on the water right application process and the various meetings held with State Board Staff.

Discussion followed.

ACTION/RESERVOIR COMMITTEE:

It was moved by Tincher, seconded by Vanderwaal to authorize the Executive Director to submit the Project's water right application for a Sites water right to the State Water Resources Control Board including associated application fee.

Motion carried unanimously.

ACTION/AUTHORITY BOARD:

It was moved by Director Sutton, seconded by Director Allen to authorize the Executive Director to submit the Project's water right application for a Sites water right to the State Water Resources Control Board including associated application fee.

Motion carried: All Directors present voted yes.

2.3 Consider authorizing the Executive Director to execute a proposal letter with partners to cooperatively develop terms and conditions for consideration in the Prop 1 Benefit Agreement with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to incorporate an Environmental Water Manager "pilot" as part of the Sites Project implementation.

Executive Director Brown provided an overview of the Environmental Water Manager Pilot Project and spoke to the following:

Environmental Water Manager Concept

- State would actively manage its Proposition 1 water similar to all other members.
 - Make annual, monthly, weekly decisions on how to use ecosystem water for the environment.
 - Work with Authority as conditions change or challenges arise.
- Proposing "pilot project" with Environmental Defense Fund and The Nature Conservancy to develop concept into "pilot" form for Sites for proposal to CDFW.
 - Frame up and demonstrate how the concept might be used as Sites/CDFW develop benefits agreement.
 - Adapt theory into practical implementable actions.

Key Considerations in Formulating Pilot Project Proposal:

- Must be within Project's Storage Principles.
- Advisory Committee used to guide proposal effort.
- Will consider possible coordination of Sites environmental water with other state assets.
- Each organization provides its own funding.
 - Sites providing technical (modeling) and staff time.

Outcomes of Efforts:

- Primary end product = "mini operations plan" for environmental water.
 - Complete around mid-summer 2022.

- Staff would return to Reservoir Committee and Authority Board to seek authority to incorporate specific terms and conditions into benefits agreement with CDFW.
- Would not impact schedule for receiving final Proposition 1 funding award.

Mr. Kunde expressed concern regarding proposed language within the Agreement.

Discussion followed.

ACTION/RESERVOIR COMMITTEE:

It was moved by Kunde, seconded by Pryor to authorize the Executive Director to execute a proposal letter with partners to cooperatively develop terms and conditions for consideration in the Prop 1 Benefit Agreement with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to incorporate an Environmental Water Manager "pilot" as part of the Sites Project implementation, with edits to the proposed language in the Agreement as discussed.

The motion carried unanimously.

ACTION/AUTHORITY BOARD:

It was moved by Director Sutton, seconded by Director Dennis to authorize the Executive Director to execute a proposal letter with partners to cooperatively develop terms and conditions for consideration in the Prop 1 Benefit Agreement with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to incorporate an Environmental Water Manager "pilot" as part of the Sites Project implementation, with edits to the proposed language in the Agreement as discussed.

Motion carried: All Directors present voted yes.

2.4 Consider authorizing revisions to the Funding Credit and Reimbursement Policy to incorporate an opportunity cost fee for new participants, key terms related to a waiting list for interested participants and discuss the priority system for admitting new participants. (Attachment A & B)

Mr. Robinette provided an overview of the Credit Reimbursement Policy Updates and spoke to the following:

Credit Reimbursement Policy Updates:

- 1. Establish an **Opportunity Cost Fee** for new participants.
- 2. Establish key terms related to a waiting list of new participants.
- 3. Establish a **priority system** for allocating available capacity to participants (discussion only).

Opportunity Cost Fee:

- Additional fee to be charged to new participants.
 - Not applicable to current or prior participants.
 - Not applicable to state or federal funding.

- Acknowledges the investment by early Reservoir Project Agreement members enabling project progress. Intended to represent:
 - The time-value-of-money
 - Opportunity cost from other investments incurred by early members
- Revenue from fees to be applied to long-term credit reimbursement liability
- Will be based on 3% fixed rate on the schedule of cumulative cash contributions, coming to \$15.21/af of supply

Calculating the Opportunity Cost Fee

Investment Return Rate:

Fee represents a reasonable expected return on investment for funding the project, striking a balance between savings and borrow cost rates. Recommend a fixed rate of 3%.

Waiting List:

- Creation of a waiting list for new participants based on submission of a Letter of Interest by March 31, 2022.
- Assures the project remains fully subscribed.
- Will be subject to 2022 opportunity cost fee when/if invited to participate
 - Will not be subject to any future additional fees.
- Will be considered in place of use and points of re-diversion.

Priority System - 2020 Rebalancing:

- Discuss the priority system for allocating available capacity to participants utilized by the Authority in 2020
 - o Maintains the goal of total Sacramento Valley Participation of 25%
 - Sub-priorities would be based on seniority or exit date of prior participants.
- 2020 Priority System:
- Sacramento Valley participants with the following sub-priorities:
 - Current participant
 - Prior participant.
 - New participant.
- Current Reservoir Committee participating members.
- Prior participant outside of the Sacramento Valley.
- New participant outside of the Sacramento Valley.

Priority System - Discussion:

- What changes are needed to reflect our preferred project and the potential for increased federal investment?
- Should we adjust the 25% Sac Valley target? If so, what is the right target?
 - o Current participation level is 26% Sac Valley.
- Should priority be different once the Sac Valley Target has been met?

Actions Today:

- 1. Establish an Opportunity Cost Fee for new participants
- 2. Establish key terms related to a waiting list of new participants

Next Steps:

- Consider changes to priority system in April.
- Work to complete rebalancing April-June.
- Revise policy and bring back to Budget and Finance Committee, including other administrative updates.

Discussion followed.

ACTION/RESERVOIR COMMITTEE:

It was moved by Traynham, seconded by Tincher to approve the opportunity cost fee of \$15.21/AF for 2022 based on an assumed fixed 3% investment rate, to apply this fee to new participants only, that revenue generated by this fee be applied to the existing long-term credit reimbursement liability, and further, to create a Priority List of entities who submitted formal letters of request by March 31, 2022 be establish, with the caveat that if they are not invited to participate in the current year, they only be subject to the \$15.21/AF rather than opportunity fees set in subsequent years.

Motion carried unanimously.

ACTION/AUTHORITY BOARD:

It was moved by Director Evans, seconded by Director Allen to approve the opportunity cost fee of \$15.21/AF for 2022 based on an assumed fixed 3% investment rate, to apply this fee to new participants only, that revenue generated by this fee be applied to the existing long-term credit reimbursement liability, and further, to create a Priority List of entities who submitted formal letters of request by March 31, 2022 be established, with the caveat that if they are not invited to participate in the current year, they only be subject to the \$15.21/AF rather than opportunity fees set in subsequent years.

Motion carried: All Directors present voted yes.

3. Discussion and Information Items:

3.1 Receive an update on public comments on the Revised Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS. (Attachments A & B)

Ms. Forsythe provided an update on public comments received on the Revised Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS. She noted approximately 101 comment letters with about 1,000 individual comments were received during the public comment period, which included:

- 18 letters from public agencies and tribes.
- 10 letters from NGOs.

 26 from individuals and NGOs who commented during the public meetings.

Discussion followed with no action taken.

3.2 Receive an update on the status of the Federal Endangered Species Act Biological Assessment for the Project's construction components.

Ms. Forsythe provided an update on the status of the Federal Endangered Species Action Biological Assessment and spoke to the following:

ESA Quick Reminder and Status:

Biological Assessment.

- Authority & Reclamation prepare.
- Covers both construction and Operations (terrestrial and aquatics).

Reclamation Submits BA to USFWS and NMFS-Late May/Early June.

- Reclamation has final review and approval.
- Submitted under Reclamation Letterhead.

Biological Opinions-End of 2022/Early 2023.

- One from USFWS Terrestrial and Delta Smelt.
- One from NMFS Anadromous Fish.

Terrestrial Species Covered

- Take likely necessary for Conservancy fairy shrimp, Vernal pool fairy shrimp, Vernal pool tadpole shrimp, Valley elderberry longhorn beetle, California red-legged frog and Giant Garter Snake (state listed also).
- Not requesting take for Palmate-bracted bird's beak, Keck's checkermallow, Western yellow-billed cuckoo and must avoid if found OR reconsult.

Preliminary Habitat Estimate for Terrestrial Species:

USFWS-Managed Species	Conservatively Est. Modeled Habitat
Conservancy fair shrimp	Up to 240 acres¹
Vernal pool fairy shrimp	Up to 240 acres¹
Vernal pool tadpole shrimp	Up to 240 acres¹
Valley elderberry longhorn beetle	Up to 250 shrubs¹
California red-legged frog	Up to 287 acres of modeled aquatic habitat and 6,765 qd43w or modeled upland habitat
Giant garter snake	Up to 2 acres of aquatic habitat and 27 acres of Upland habitat

Note: Estimated effects based on aerial imagery and CNDDB occurrence and expected to be a conservative estimate. Actual amounts of permanent and temporary impacts will be determined during surveys prior to Project construction.

1. This is the same 240 acres as it could be potential habitat for any or all of these three vernal pool species

Take Minimization Measures

 Measures to reduce amount of take include: Construction windows and buffer areas, Construction best management practices, Restoration on temporarily affected habitat, Preconstruction surveys, Habitat mapping and flagging, Avoidance of habitat and Biological monitoring.

Proposed Mitigation Approach

- Compensatory mitigation for take is required
- Diverse approach.
 - Sites-lead off-site habitat acquisition or restoration.
 - Conservation easements.
 - Conservation banks / mitigation banks.
 - o On-site opportunistic habitat preservation/restoration.
- Each has different risks.
- Prepare detailed mitigation strategy in 2022/2023.

Next Steps:

- April meeting.
 - o Financial assurance discussion.
 - Operations/aquatics effects (may move to May depending on modeling).
- May meeting Approval for Executive Director to submit the Biological Assessment and Operations ITP Application.
- June meeting Submit to Reclamation Biological Assessment to USFWS and NMFS.

Discussion followed with no action taken.

3.3 Review and comment on Amendment 3 Project Agreement Approval Process including estimated participation levels, outreach and rebalancing, and schedule.

Executive Director Brown provided an update on the Amendment 3 Project Agreement Approval Process including estimated participation levels, outreach and rebalancing, and schedule. He noted that staff met with the prospective new participants as a group on March 8, 2022 to provide an overview of the rebalancing effort, what is being considered in regard to these matters today, and possible next steps. He stated decisions on participation levels are due on March 31, 2022. Discussion followed with no action taken.

3.4 Receive an update on the message platform.

Mr. Spesert provided an update on the message platform including the new format the communications team developed based on feedback from

participants wanting the format to focus more on topic areas, and an updated version based on where the project is currently. He stated the document was reviewed multiple times by the Legislative and Outreach Committee and approved by the Legislative and Outreach Committee at its February 17th meeting. Mr. Spesert noted the Message Platform will continue to be updated as issues continue to emerge.

4. Reports:

4.1 <u>Chairpersons' Reports</u>:

None.

4.2 <u>Committee & Workgroup Chairpersons' Reports:</u>

Reservoir Operations & Engineering Workgroup

Mr. Kunde provided an update on the Workgroup's meeting held on March 9, 2022 regarding a briefing on Geotech legal work objectives and goals and timeframes as well as discussion about the Deadpool.

Environmental Planning & Permitting Workgroup

Chair Bettner noted that their last Environmental meeting took place on March 14th. He announced he will be looking for a new Chair and Co-Chair for the Environmental Planning & Permitting Committee.

Authority Board Chair Durst made time for Committee and Workgroup Chairpersons' reports.

<u>Authority Board/Budget & Finance</u>

None.

Authority Board/Land Management

Director Evans provided a brief update on the Geotech work being done at the project site, as well as TOPO setting up satellites.

Authority Board/Legislative and Outreach

Mr. Spesert provided an update regarding the Legislative and Outreach team putting together a letter in support of the STREAM Act and they will be submitting the letter to Senator Feinstein on Monday, March 21st.

Director Sutton provided a brief update on the various Legislative and Outreach matters considered/discussed.

4.3 Authority Board & Reservoir Committee Participant Reports:

None.

4.4 <u>Executive Director's Reports</u>:

Executive Director Brown provided an update on the following:

- Monthly status report.
- Work Plan Key Deliverables Report.
- Meetings Action Items Summary.
- 2021 Annual Report.
- CA Water Commission Meeting held on March 16th regarding the \$65 million in unallocated funds and distribution of same. He noted the Commission on a 6 to 2 vote, approved the option to allocate \$25 million to Sites for a total of \$39 million. He further noted all the projects are fully funded. Discussion followed.
- WIFIA loan application (low interest loan) Update announcement released on March 17th.

Mr. Robinette provided an update on the WIFIA loan application and spoke to the following:

WIFIA Benefits

- ✓ Low-interest, flexible financing to cover up to 49% of Project costs (currently \$2.2B)- has the potential to reduce the unit cost of Sites Reservoir water by as much as 10%.
- ✓ Covers 80% of Project financing requirements when combined with the USDA Loan.
- ✓ Hedge against future rate increases.
 - Rate is determined at execution of loan agreement.
 - Rates can be 'refinanced' if interest rates drop before first draw.

Construction Cash Flow

Range of Costs by Year -Colusa County Example-2022 thru 2031

Source of Funding

Comparison with and without WIFIA

Source of Funding (\$ millions)

	WSIP	Federal	Revenue Bonds	USDA	WIFIA	Total
Case 3 (No WIFIA; Current Rates)	836	310	2,859	440	-	4,445
% of total	19%	7%	64%	10%	0%	100%
Case 6 (WIFIA loan up To 49% of	836	310	664	440	2,202	4,452

Fritz Durst, Authority Board Chair

Yolanda Tirado, Board Clerk

Thad Bettner, Reservoir Committee Chair

Meeting: Joint Reservoir Committee & Authority Board March 18, 2022

Subject: Roll Call 9:00 AM - 12:00 PM

Current Voting Committee Participants (23):

	Pct	Participant
	3.37	American Canyon, City
	2.32	Antelope Valley-East Kern WA
\boxtimes	2.26	Carter MWC
\boxtimes	5.16	Coachella Valley WD
\boxtimes	5.16	Colusa County
\boxtimes	5.18	Colusa Co. WD
\boxtimes	2.31	Cortina WD (1)
\boxtimes	2.77	Davis WD
	0.00	Department of Water Resources (non-voting)
\boxtimes	4.11	Desert WA
\boxtimes	3.06	Dunnigan WD
\boxtimes	3.67	Glenn-Colusa ID
	2.47	Irvine Ranch WD

	5 :	
	Pct	Participant
\boxtimes	2.47	LaGrande WD (1)
\boxtimes	17.09	Metropolitan WD
\boxtimes	3.37	Reclamation District 108
	2.32	Rosedale-Rio Bravo WSD
\boxtimes	8.56	San Bernardino Valley MWD
\boxtimes	6.35	San Gorgonio Pass WA
\boxtimes	2.32	Santa Clara Valley WD
\boxtimes	3.67	Santa Clarita Valley WA
\boxtimes	3.78	Westside WD
\boxtimes	3.08	Wheeler Ridge-Maricopa WSD
	.00	US Bureau of Reclamation (non-voting)
\boxtimes	5.16	Zone 7 WA
	100.00	Total

20 Voting members represented at Meeting start oximes

92% Represented participation percentage

Representation has been delegated as follows:

- (1) To Jamie Traynham, Davis WD
- (‡) Not present after _____

Meeting

Joint Authority Board & Reservoir Committee

March 18, 2022

Subject: Attendance

9:00 AM - 12:00 PM

Current Voting Authority Board Participants:

Participant	?	Representative	?	Alternate/Delegate
Colusa County	\boxtimes	Gary Evans		Mike Azevedo
Colusa County Water District		Joe Marsh		Doug Griffen
				Shelly Murphy
Glenn County		Ken Hahn	Ш	Thomas Arnold
Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District	\boxtimes	Logan Dennis		Don Bransford
Reclamation District 108	\boxtimes	Fritz Durst		Sean Doherty
City of Roseville / Placer County Water Agency		Gray Allen		Joshua Alpine
Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority		Jeff Sutton		Halbert Charter
City of Sacramento / Sacramento		Jeff Harris		Brett Ewart
County Water Agency		Jen Hains		Anne Sanger
Westside Water District		Doug Parker		Zach Dennis
Associate Members (2 non-voting	g):			
Participant	?	Representative	?	Alternate
TC4		Jamie Traynham		Tom Charter
Western Canal Water District		Ted Trimble		Greg Johnson
Current Voting Reservoir Commit	tee	Participants (23):		
				Alternate/Delega
Participant	?	Representative	?	te
American Canyon, City		Felix Hernandez		Jason Holley
Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency	<i>'</i> □	Dwayne Chisam		Dan Flory
Carter Mutual Water Company		Ben Carter		Ann Carter Charlie Palmer Kendra Carter
Coachella Valley Water District		Robert Cheng		Petya Vasileva
Colusa County	\boxtimes	Mike Azevedo	\boxtimes	Gary Evans

						Alternate/Delega
Participant		?	Represe	ntative	?	te
Colusa County Water Di	strict	\boxtimes	Shelley N	lurphy		Joe Marsh
Cortina Water District			Jim Peter	rson		Chuck Grimmer Jamie Traynham
Davis Water District			Jamie Tra	aynham		Tom Charter
Desert Water Agency			Mark Krause			Steve Johnson
Dunnigan Water District			Bill Vanderwaal			Jake Spooner
Glenn-Colusa Irrigation	District		Thad Bet	Thad Bettner		Holley Dawley
Irvine Ranch Water Dist	rict		Paul Weg	ghorst	\boxtimes	Kellie Welch
LaGrande Water District			Zach Den	inis		Ken LaGrande Jamie Traynham
Metropolitan Water Dis	trict		Randall N	leudeck		Nina Hawk
RD 108			Bill Vand	erwaal		Blair Lewis
Rosedale-Rio Bravo Wat	er District		Trent Tay	/lor		Dan Bartel
San Bernardino Valley W	ater District		Bob Tincl	her		Heather Dyer
San Gorgonio Pass Wate	r Agency		Lance Eckhart			Thomas Todd
Santa Clara Valley Wate	r District		Cindy Kao			Andrew Garcia
Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency			Dirk Mar	ks		Steve Cole
Westside Water District			Allan My	ers		Dan Ruiz
Wheeler Ridge-Maricop District	a Water Storage		Rob Kund	de		Sheridan Nicholas
Zone 7 Water Agency			Valerie P	ryor		Amparo Flores
Non-Voting Commit	tee Participan	ts (2	2):			
	Represent	ative		Alternate/0	Oth	
Participant Dant of Water	<pre>② Other</pre>		?	er		
Dept of Water Resources	Rob Cooke			Jagruti Maro	ney 🛭	Alex Vdovichenko
	X Itzia Rivera			Jim Wieking		Dave Arrate
Bureau of Reclamation	Richard We	lsh		Don Bader		Chris Duke
	✓ Vanessa Kin✓ Natalie Tayl	_		Derya Sumer Michael Mos	=	Jessica Boyt Shana Kaplan

Authority, Non-Sig	natory	(6):			
Participant	?	Representati ve	? <i>A</i>	Alternate	Alternate
PCWA		Ed Horton		Ben Barker	Darin Reintjes
Roseville		Sean Bigley	П Т	revor Joseph	Jason Marks
Sacramento County W	/A 🖂	Kerry Schmitz		Michael Peterson	
Staff:					
? Name	Represe	enting	? N	ame	Representing
\boxtimes Brown, Jerry	Sites Pro	ject Authority	⊠tı	rapasso, Joe	Sites Project Authority
$oxed{\sum}$ Forsythe, Ali	Sites Pro	ject Authority	⊠ti	irado, Yolanda	Sites Project Authority
$oxed{ ext{Robinette, JP}}$	Sites Pro	ject Authority	\boxtimes Y i	arbrough, Sandra	Sites Project Authority
$oxed{ ext{Spesert, Kevin}}$	Sites Pro	ject Authority			
Consultants:					
2 Name	Repres	enting	?	Name	Representing
Alexander,Jeriann	Fugro			Leaf, Robert	Ch2m
Boling, Robert	HDR			Luu, Henry	HDR
Briard, Monique	ICF			McDonald C	CMD West
Brown, Doug	Stradling	7		Micko, Steve	Ch2m
Brown, Scott	_	5	\boxtimes	Maltby, Marcus	Brown & Caldwell
	LWA	Ca:a		Montague, Doug	Montague DeRose Asso
☐ Bruner, Marc	Perkins (Loie		Nielsen, Caitlin	HDR
Forrest, Mike	AECOM			Rossetto, Sarah	Katz & Associates
☐ Floyd, Kim	Floyd			Rude, Peter	Ch2m
Harris, Cheyanne	Brown 8	c Caldwell		Spranza, John	HDR
Herrin, Jeff	AECOM			Traynham,	
Heydinger, Erin	HDR			Hailey	Brown & Caldwell
Katz, Sara	Katz & A	ssociates		Van Camp, Marc	MBK
Kivett, Marcia	Brown 8	c Caldwell		Warner Herson, Laurie	Phenix
Doud, Alan	Young W	/ooldridge	\square	Manual Calls	LIDB

Westcot, Cathy HDR

Other Attendees: (Check box to have email address added to the distribution list)

Name	Representing	Contact (Phone & E-mail)
Juleah Cordi	Assemblyman Michael Gallagher's Office	
Laura Nicholson	Senator Jim Nielsen's Office	
Angela Bezzone	MBK Engineers	
Erin Huang	Jacobs	
Anthony Saracino		
Cindy Saks	SBVMWD	
Andy Hitchings	Somach Law	
Aaron Ferguson	Somach Law	
Lillian Xie	Zone 7	
Greg Plucker		
Stephen Arakawa	MWD	
Katherine Maher	Valley Water	
Travis Millwee	RTSAG	
Chandra Chilmakuri	SWC	